

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JUL 07 2008**

Application No. 10/814,146
Amendment dated: July 7, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of April 7, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1988PUS1
Page 8

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 17 and 18 are independent. Claims 1, 8, 12-14, 17 and 18 have been amended and claim 4 and 16 has been canceled by the present amendment. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 8 and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. In light of this indication, claims 8, 17 and 18 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. Claim 16 has been canceled. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claims 8, 17 and 18 are allowable.

Further, the Examiner states that claims 4 and 12-14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the written or amended base claim and any intervening claims. In light of this indication, claims 12-14 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. The feature of claim 4 has been included in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claims 1 and 12-14 are allowable.

In addition, the Examiner states that claims 9-11 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. However, claims 9-11 and 15 have not been rewritten in independent form at this time, since it is believed that amended independent claim 8 from which these claims depend is allowable.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/814,146
Amendment dated: July 7, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of April 7, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1988PUS1
Page 9

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 18 because of several informalities. In order to overcome this objection, Applicant has amended claim 18 in order to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1, 4, 8, 12-14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 12-14, 17 and 18 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Further, claims 4 and 16 have been canceled and thus the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 4 and 16 is moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,088. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants are herewith submitting a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on the present application which would extend beyond the expiration of U.S. Patent No. 7,328,088. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/814,146
Amendment dated: July 7, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of April 7, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1988PUS1
Page 10

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bruyne in view of Passey. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 has been further amended to include the allowable subject matter of canceled claim 4. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other features, "prestoring position numbers for discriminating positions of at least one or more ultrasonic signal reception unit for receiving the ultrasonic signals, among a plurality of ultrasonic signal reception units, in order to detect a direction that the mobile robot proceeds, wherein the RF signal is emitted at preset time intervals."

Neither De Bruyne nor Passey teaches or suggests the features of amended independent claim 1, "prestoring position numbers for discriminating positions of at least one or more ultrasonic signal reception unit for receiving the ultrasonic signals, among a plurality of ultrasonic signal reception units, in order to detect a direction that the mobile robot proceeds."

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final, in that it raises no new issues but merely places the claims in a form more clearly patentable over the references of record. In the alternative, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it reduces the issues for appeal.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 07 2008

Application No. 10/814,146
Amendment dated: July 7, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of April 7, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1988PUS1
Page 11

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Jun S. Ha, Registration No. 58,508, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.


Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By


James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP